

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XI.

NOV 2 1917

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1917

No. 5

## GRAPHIC LATIN

### The Entire Language at Four Glances

The eight parts of speech, outlined in full with forms, rules and examples, are arranged on four charts for study and use in the class-room. Chart I., THE NOUN; Chart II., THE ADJECTIVE AND THE ADVERB; Chart III., THE VERB; Chart IV., THE PRONOUN, THE PREPOSITION, THE CONJUNCTION, and THE INTERJECTION.

***"At a glance the student can see the  
essential parts of Latin Grammar"***

—Frank T. McClure, Teacher, Allegheny High School, Pittsburg, Pa.

### Adopted

for general class-room use by teachers in over sixty regular High Schools and twenty Private Schools *the first year.*

### Handy in Form

The four charts, each 14x18 inches, appear on the four double pages of a 10-page pamphlet, 9x14 inches, of heavy, white, durable, ledger paper. The pamphlet is folded once and glued in an extra heavy, tough, manila cover, 7x9 inches, which protects the charts perfectly and reduces them to handy form when not in use. The outfit is practical and extremely simple to operate.

### Price per copy, 40c

10% discount on orders of 1 dozen or over.

Transportation charges prepaid.

Address the author,

**JOHN C. GREEN, Jr.**

Latin Instructor, BLAIR ACADEMY

BLAIRSTOWN, N. J.



FOR SECOND-YEAR STUDENTS

# PORTA LATINA

A Reading Method

By FRANK GARDNER MOORE

62 pages 60 cents

A book for the second year student which aims to institute a logical method of attack in translation, correcting the bad habits formed in the first year and developing the habit of reading from the page as one person reads aloud to another.

The text consists of fifty of La Fontaine's fables in Latin with a system of punctuation which guides the student in grouping the related words into phrases and clauses.

**GINN AND COMPANY**

70 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

## Beginners' Latin for Junior High Schools

**NUTTING'S LATIN PRIMER**

**NUTTING'S FIRST LATIN READER**

(Editions with and without English-Latin exercises)

By H. C. NUTTING, PH.D., Assistant Professor of Latin, University of California

These two books cover the field commonly known as "First Year Latin". The course, however, is simpler and more gradual than the conventional beginners' book in Latin. Where more than four years are devoted to Latin, an entire year may be given up to each book. But when used in regular High Schools both books can easily be mastered in the first year.

Based on the *gradatim* plan, these books concentrate definitely upon the problem of developing the pupil's power to read Latin. The number of words in each lesson is small, and interesting dialogue and narrative are developed early. From the start translation "at sight" establishes itself in the most natural manner as the norm. The reading material is full of human interest and includes stories of early American history, short anecdotes, simplified narratives from Caesar, and selections from the original text of Caesar, Nepos, Suetonius, Sallust, and Cicero.

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 29, 1917

No. 5

## MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY are familiar with the *Lingua Latina* series, edited under the direction of Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, and Mr. S. O. Andrew, to exemplify the Direct Method as applied to Latin. The series, at first, comprised the following books: *Primus Annus*, A First Year's Course, intended for beginners in Latin, by W. L. Paine and C. L. Mainwaring; *Decem Fabulae Pueris Puellisque Agendae*, characterized by the editors as A Companion Volume of Plays, by Messrs. Paine and Mainwaring and Miss E. Ryle; *Praeceptor*, A Master's Book, by S. O. Andrew, whose purpose is to inform teachers how the Direct Method may be used.

To these there have been several recent additions.

Mr. F. R. Dale, Assistant Master at Leeds Grammar School, published, in 1915, *Reges Consulesque Romani, Fabulae ex T. Livi Historia* (84 pages. Oxford University Press. 50 cents). The text (pages 7-55) gives, in Part I, fifteen stories concerning the *Reges Romani* (7-29), and, in Part II, seventeen stories concerning the *Libera Romanorum Respublica*. We thus have 32 stories in 48 pages of text (the text is printed in a large, clear, handsome type). The selection of stories is well made. According to the Preface,

This selection from the first books of Livy is for classes which are ready to tackle a Latin author. The passages have not been simplified in syntax, and only such modification of the text has been made as the detachment of the selected pieces renders necessary. The book will serve to acquaint the reader with most of the well-known stories of early Rome, from the foundation to the end of the first stage of Roman expansion—the final subjugation of the Latins.

Mr. Dale does not say how much training in Latin classes must have before they "are ready to tackle a Latin author". It remains to add that vowel quantities are marked throughout, though nothing is said to indicate what guide was followed here, and that there is a Vocabulary (56-84). This Vocabulary is interesting, in that all the definitions are given in Latin. Thus *abdo* is defined by *celo*; *abigo* by *abire cogo*; *abnuo* by *recuso*; *accensi* by *militēs qui non in legionibus numerabantur, sed in subsidiis aderant*; *ago* by *facio, gero, prae me ire cogo*. Under *ago* the phrase *ago cum aliquo* is defined by *de re proposita colloquor*; *anceps* is defined by *duo capita gerens*; *neutro inclinatus, aequus*; *duplex (caput)*.

There is nothing in the book to indicate from what parts of Livy the several stories are taken. One who

has a Teubner text of Livy can, however, easily enough locate the stories by looking up in the Index of the Teubner edition the proper names that occur in the stories.

Mr. L. R. Strangeways, Chief Classical Master at the High School, Nottingham, has edited P. Ovidi Nasonis *Elegiaca* (74 pages. Oxford Press, 1915. 50 cents). The text (7-52) falls into four parts, whose subjects are *Res Romanae* (7-17), *Res Fabulosae* (18-29), *Res Humanae* (30-43), and *Epistulae* (44-52). In Part I, besides other passages, all from the *Fasti*, we find *Raptio Sabinarum*, *Fabiorum Pietas*, and *Lupa Nutrix*. In Part II we have the stories of *Arion*, *Ars Daedalea*, *Pyladis et Orestae Amor Mirus*, *Herculis et Caci Certamen*, etc. Here the editor drew on the *Fasti*, the *Ars Amatoria*, and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Part III is drawn mainly from the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and the *Tristia*, and deals largely with the poet's own experiences, especially his exile. Here the captions of the selections are *Mobilis Heu Fortuna*; *Temporis Effectus*; *Carminis Vis Medica*; *Aeternitas Famae*; *In Pelago Tempestas*; *Vita Poetae Ipsius*; *Exilium*; *Incommoda Senectutis*; *Ab Exule Litterae*. Part IV gives selections from the *Heroides*, as follows: *Penelope Ulixi*; *Oenone Paridi*; *Dido Aeneae*; *Leander Heroni*; *Laodamia <sic> Protesilao*; *Hypermnestra Lynceo*. The source of the selection is in each case carefully indicated.

Prefixed to each selection is an introduction, in Latin. There are also a few brief notes, in Latin. Finally there is a Vocabulary, entitled *Vocabula Selecta*, with definitions in Latin (there is no hint of the basis of selection here). Vowel quantities are marked throughout.

To the *Lingua Latina* series belongs also the *Villa Cornelianae*, "A Wall Picture designed by E. M. Carter in collaboration with the Editors", as the announcements have it. Of this the less said the better. How any one could get from it any clear conception of a villa Romana—or of anything Roman—I fail to see.

Within the last two or three years Ovid has come in for special attention, evidently, in England. Besides the volume referred to above, by Mr. Strangeways, the Oxford University Press published in 1914, in three small volumes, a work entitled *Ovid: Elegiac Poems*, by J. W. E. Pearce (pp. xxvii+210; xxxiv+206; xxviii+181. 50 cents each). Mr. Pearce is Head Master of Merton Court Preparatory School, Sidcup.



In each volume there is an Introduction, in three parts. In each case Part I gives a Life of Ovid, Part 2 a discussion of Ovid as a Poet.

Volume I gives the Earlier Poems, Selected from the *Heroides*, the *Amores*, The *Ars Amatoria*, and the *Remedia Amoris*; Volume II gives The Roman Calendar, Selections from the *Fasti*; Volume III gives Letters from Exile, Selected from the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Part 3 of the Introduction in each volume is an account of the particular works of Ovid from which the selections in that volume were derived. Volumes II and III carry, at the beginning, a map of Republican Rome, and, at the end, a map of Rome in the Time of Augustus. In each case the map is in part on the inside of the cover, in part on the adjoining page. These maps are sensible, avoiding excessive detail.

In Volume I there are 85 pages of text, 118 pages of notes; in II, 90 pages of text, 110 pages of notes; in III, 76 pages of text, 100 pages of notes. Each volume has also an Index to <the> Notes, and an Index of Proper Names. There are no vocabularies.

These volumes form part of a New Clarendon Press Series of Classical Authors for the Use of Schools. The General Editor of the Series is Rev. A. E. Hillard, Head Master of St. Paul's School. In a prefatory Note by the General Editor we read:

I may explain briefly that one condition of the series was that no volume should be included in it which was not edited by a schoolmaster with practical and lengthy experience in teaching the author on whom he wrote; and further, to avoid the danger of mere 'bookmaking', that every author must be dealt with by some editor with a real enthusiasm for his subject.

There is a further explanation that the series includes also editions of all seven books of the *De Bello Gallico*, by T. Rice Holmes (each book in a separate volume).

Mr. Pearce thus sets forth his own aims (Preface):

My chief aim in the notes has been to try to create in the beginner a taste for Latin poetry, by leading him to appreciate points of style and expression, and by encouraging him to a comparison of passages from our own literature. Needless to say many notes will be rendered superfluous if the passage to be prepared is first read aloud with due emphasis by the master.

These volumes should find a hearty welcome. They add much to the material available for reading in Ovid, whether in sight classes or in prepared work. C. K.

(To be concluded)

### THE CLASSICS AND THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION<sup>1</sup>

The fourhundredth anniversary of the Protestant Reformation, which is to be celebrated on October 31, 1917, has called forth a great number of books and articles on the various phases of this complex movement. It may, therefore, not be amiss for classicists to

<sup>1</sup>In this paper Luther's works are cited according to the Erlangen edition of Ploch, Irmischer, et al. (1839-1886); his letters according to the edition of De Wette (Berlin, 1825-1856); Melancthon's

consider what rôle the Classics played with the leading men of the Reformation. Did the Reformers know the writings of the Greeks and the Romans? Were they influenced by them? Did they assign to them any rôle in their programme?

Martin Luther received his earliest education at Mansfield (C. R. 6.156), where, besides the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and some hymns, he studied Donatus, another elementary Latin Grammar, and the so-called *Cisio Janus*, a queer calendar containing mnemonic verses on the Church festivals. Luther in after life complained bitterly of the crude methods of teaching (Op. 22.191). Later he went to Magdeburg and soon after to Eisenach, where for four years he worked under good teachers and finished his grammatical studies. The University of Erfurt was not very good, but he began his real reading of Latin authors there. He read them for their content, not for their style; Cicero, Vergil, and Livy were the authors he favored (C. R. 6.155).

Luther travelled to Rome in 1510, and, though this journey was made not primarily in the interests of his education, it cannot have been without influence on his stand toward Roman antiquity. It must have made the subject-matter of the Latin writers more real to him than it could have been without a knowledge of their country.

It is interesting to see with what works Luther was acquainted and what he thought of them. Of the prose writers Cicero is quoted most often by him and valued very highly, especially because of his ethical content. Cicero's *De Officiis* is better, Luther thinks, than the *Ethics* of Aristotle; his Letters cannot be well understood unless the reader has had a good training in the art of government (Op. 62.341). Luther also admired Cicero's dialectic power and eloquence (Op. 31.12; 62.341). Although Luther does not agree with Erasmus, who says that, after reading the *De Senectute*, he felt like exclaiming, "Sancte Cicero, ora pro nobis", he does think that the Roman's chances of eternal salvation are better than those of the Pope or the Archbishop of Mayence (Schmidt, 14). There are also plenty of quotations in Luther's works from Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, Quintilian, Varro, Gellius, and Seneca. Livy, Sallust, and Suetonius are not mentioned frequently. Some acquaintance with Tacitus is shown by Luther's remark that the Germans of his day do not

works according to the *Corpus Reformatorum*, by C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindseil (Brunswick, 1834-1860).

For convenience these three works are named by abbreviations as follows: Op., De W., and C. R.

Other works cited are:

Johannes Mathesius, *Luthers Leben in Predigen*, edited by G. Loeschke (Prague, 1906).

E. G. Sihler, *Luther and the Classics, in Four Hundred Years* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1916).

Oswald G. Schmidt, *Luthers Bekanntheit mit den Alten Klassikern* (Berlin, 1883).

James W. Richard, *Philip Melancthon, the Protestant Preceptor of Germany* (New York, 1902).

Joachim Camerarius, *De Vita Philippi Melancthonis Narratio*, edited by G. Th. Strobel (Halle, 1777; original edition 1566). This work is referred to by the abbreviation Cam.

Karl Hartfelder, *Philip Melancthon als Praeceptor Germaniae*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, 7 (Berlin, 1889).

come up to the description of their ancestors in the Germania (Op. 62.405).

Of the poets Terence seems to have influenced Luther very much. This is quite natural, for Terence was one of the most popular authors of the Middle Ages. There are countless allusions to him in the Reformer's writings. But Vergil was perhaps his favorite. This author surpasses all others *heroica gravitate*, he says (Op. 62.343). He liked the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics* best; this is only what we should expect of the son of a peasant (Schmidt, 26). Luther quotes Vergil constantly: *Quos ego . . . ; forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit; fuimus Troes*, etc.

The elegance and the charm of Ovid also gave keen pleasure to Luther (De W. 1.190). Oddly enough Luther rated Horace below Prudentius (Op. 62.104); still he borrowed many proverbial expressions from the Augustan poet. Juvenal was rather well known too. The Reformer bought a copy of Lucan when he was already middle-aged (Op. 62.343). The late Latin *Disticha* of Dionysius Cato were prime favorites. 'Next to the Bible, we have no better book than *Catonis scripta* and *fabulas Aesopi*' (Op. 62.459). Juvenal, Martial, Catullus, and the *Priapea*, he says, ought not to be read in the Schools (Op. 62.344).

Luther's knowledge of Greek is much less extensive than his knowledge of Latin. Where he acquired it is not definitely known. He studied under Melanchthon at Wittenberg after 1518 (De W. 1.138), but knew some Greek before this time. He was able to translate the Greek New Testament in 1518. But, when one of his friends wrote several Greek letters to him, he became very angry, and said he wished he could reply in Turkish in order that his correspondent might also be forced to read a letter he could not understand (De W. 4.16). Another time he punished a similar offense by including in his reply a German nonsense verse written in Hebrew letters (Mathesius, Sermon 12). Still, he knew Homer rather well and made frequent allusions to the story and the mythology of his poems. Some of the other Greek poets are also quoted in Luther's writings, but there is no proof that he had any first-hand knowledge of them. Even the philosopher Plato he knew probably only at second-hand. Aristotle, however, the foundation of the late mediaeval philosophy and largely of the theology too, he had studied thoroughly, though mostly through Latin translations. He began his teaching at Wittenberg by lectures on Aristotle's *Dialectics* and *Physics* (C. R. 6.157). However, he soon came to the conviction that the Stagirite's influence in theology was harmful and therefore he often sharply attacked him (Op. 22.196; 31.344). Aristotle was to him the personification of his great enemy, Scholasticism. Later in life his criticisms of Aristotle were milder. The regard in which he held Aesop has already been mentioned. He made a translation of a number of the *Fables* (Op. 14.349). During his stay at the Castle of Coburg, while the Diet at Augsburg was in session, he wrote to Melanchthon that he intended to

build three tabernacles on this Zion, one for the Prophets, one for the Psalter, and the third for Aesop (De W. 4.2).

But what did the Classics do for Luther? In the first place, they gave him a vehicle of expression. His Latin is indeed far removed from the Ciceronian smoothness of Erasmus or Melanchthon and from the vigor of his own German style, but it is correct, clear, and expressive. He is a complete master of the idiom. Now and then he even wrote a few Latin verses, the most interesting of which are an adaptation of Martial 10.47, in which he paraphrases the thoughts of Psalm 128 (Op. 17.265). His German poetry, too, he says was influenced by Vergil (Schmidt, 27).

Greater, but more impalpable perhaps, is the influence of the Classics in broadening his mind and opening for him new sources of knowledge. They made him familiar with the thoughts of a complex civilization; they gave him a wealth of illustration and allusion from history, philosophy, law, and natural science. They moulded his ideas of patriotism and nationalism, they opened his eyes to nature and to mankind, freed him from prejudice, and mellowed his opinions.

Let us turn for a moment to see what were Luther's relations with the humanists, the official bearers of the torch of classical learning at the time. There was among the humanists a strong feeling against the abuses of the Church, against its financial exactions, against the ignorance of the clergy and the attendant ills, and against the laxity of its morals. On these points the humanists found themselves in sympathy with Luther. Luther, too, immediately adopted several of the salient principles of humanism—the authority and value of the original sources as against the later interpreters and commentators, and, further, the right of each individual to examine and interpret these sources. However, humanism concerned classical philology, the Reformation concerned the teaching of the Church; for the one the Classics were an end in themselves, for the other a means toward an end. Therefore, some of the humanists, like Melanchthon, became Protestant; others, like Erasmus, remained Catholic.

Before we discuss the part the Reformer wished the Classics to play in his scheme of Christian education, it seems best to say a few words about his great friend and assistant, the humanist Melanchthon, because the educational work of the two is so closely bound together.

Melanchthon, the grand-nephew of the well-known humanist Reuchlin, was more fortunate in his early training than Luther had been. The town of Bretten, where he received his elementary education, seems to have had a fairly good School, but, on the advice of his famous relative, he soon became a pupil of John Unger, a splendid teacher. 'He drove me to grammar and required me to construct sentences. He made me give the rules of construction by means of twenty or thirty verses from the Mantuan'<sup>2</sup> (C. R. 25.448). When ten

<sup>2</sup>Baptista Mantuanus, 1448-1516.

years old Melanchthon went to Pforzheim, where he read Greek and Latin poets (C. R. 2, Decl. 135). Reuchlin, whom he now met frequently, gave him a Greek grammar and a copy of his own Greek-Latin lexicon. Together with some friends Melanchthon produced one of Reuchlin's School comedies in honor of the humanist—at the age of twelve (Cam. 2).

The University of Heidelberg, which he then began to attend, was scholastic, yet he continued his own reading of the authors. He writes (C. R. 5.715):

'Inasmuch as I had learned to write verse, with a kind of boyish avidity I began to read the poets and also history and the drama. This habit gradually led me to the ancient Classics. From them I acquired a vocabulary and style. We read everything without discrimination, but especially did we prefer the modern works, like those of Politian'.

He also studied rather intently the structure of the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes (C. R. 4.715). Before he was fifteen he had written several Latin elegies (C. R. 10.660. For his poems see Index to C. R. 38). At the University of Tübingen, where there was more of a humanistic atmosphere, he continued his private reading of Cicero, took up Vergil, Galen, and other writers, and heard lectures on Aristotle (Hartfelder, 35).

In 1514, at the age of seventeen, he began to teach at the University of Tübingen; Vergil, Terence, Livy, and Cicero were his subjects (Cam. 7). Two years later he published an edition of Terence (C. R. 1.13), then of a part of Plutarch. He also began a translation of Aratus into Latin verse, but soon left this to begin an edition of Aristotle's *Analytica Posteriora* (C. R. 1.26. For his translations see C. R. 17-19).

The next year Melanchthon became first Professor of Greek at Wittenberg. In his inaugural he says (C. R. 11.15):

'Only regard for the proper studies and the duties of my office . . . could induce me to commend to you the study of classical literature. I have undertaken to plead their case against those . . . who call back the German youth from the happy contest of letters by the more than Thracian remark that classical studies are more difficult than useful; that Greek is studied only by disordered intellects and that, too, for display'.

Interesting, also, in this address is the use made of a leading humanistic principle: 'When we go to the sources, then are we led to Christ'. Melanchthon began his labors at the new University by work on Homer and the Epistle to Titus.

During this time Melanchthon did not rest from his scholarly activity. In 1518 he published his lectures on the Epistle to Titus and wrote to friends that he had ready for publication a Greek dictionary, two treatises of Plutarch, a Greek hymn, Athenagoras, Plato's Symposium, and three books on rhetoric (C. R. 1.44, 50, 52). Two years later he published a hand book on Dialectics, edited the Clouds of Aristophanes, and sent

out a new edition of the Greek Grammar he had written some time before (C. R. 20.1), besides aiding Luther in the revision of his translation of the New Testament and writing a Latin Grammar for his own private School (C. R. 20.192).

This private School had been begun almost as soon as the young professor came to Wittenberg. Its purpose was to prepare boys for the University in Greek and Latin, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, and physics (Hartfelder, 491). It seems rather modern that he should have encouraged his pupils to render dialogues and comedies from Seneca, Plautus, and Terence, a practice which Luther approved (Op. 62.336). We may remark here that he also took an interest in ancient coins (Cam. 13).

But, according to the programme of the Reformers, Schools were not to be exclusively private enterprises. As early as 1520 Luther, in his appeal To the Christian Nobility (Op. 21.277), had advised that there should be public Schools in which even girls were to have at least enough instruction in German or Latin to be able to read the Gospels. Universal education was advocated also in 1524, in the pamphlet addressed to the Aldermen (Op. 22.168). Even those students who did not intend to enter a learned profession and for whose vocational training provision was to be made ought, he held, to have some schooling in Latin. This training was, of course, to be much more intensive for the future theologians, lawyers, etc. 'Although the Gospel has come and is daily coming only through the Holy Spirit, nevertheless it has come by means of the languages'.

Nuremberg, which was already fairly well supplied with Schools and with humanists, took up Luther's suggestions and asked Melanchthon's aid in realizing them, as head of a new Gymnasium. Although he declined, he went to Nuremberg and gave his aid and advice in founding the School (Cam. 31).

In 1528 appeared the Saxon Visitation Articles (C. R. M.48) which give an outline of the School system as Melanchthon wished it to be. In the first place, teachers should be careful to teach only Latin, not German, Greek, or Hebrew. The primary School was to consist of three classes, which, however, were not to be absolved in one year. In the first the pupil was to study the alphabet, the Lord's prayer, the Creed, Donatus, and Cato's *Disticha*; in the second class, he was to be occupied with Aesop (in Latin), extracts from the writings of the contemporaneous authors Mosellanus and Erasmus, and with Terence and Plautus. Besides, there was to be drill in grammar. The third division was to take up Vergil, Ovid, and the Letters or the *De Officiis* of Cicero, and to continue the study of grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric. In all classes the boys were obliged to talk Latin with the teacher and with one another. This elementary School was followed by the Gymnasium, in which the study of Latin was continued, Greek and Hebrew were begun, and Greek was continued through Isocrates, Xenophon,



Plutarch, Hesiod, Theognis, etc. (Heerwagen, *Geschichte d. Nürn. Gelehrtschulen*, Nuremberg, 1860). "We still have the correspondence between him <Melanchthon> and fifty-six cities asking counsel and assistance in founding and conducting Latin schools and gymnasia" (Richard, 134). Nearly all the Latin Schools of the sixteenth century in Germany were founded according to Melanchthon's directions. His textbooks were used in all of them. His Latin Grammar, for instance, which went through fifty-one editions from 1525 to 1737, was used in all Saxon Schools up to the latter date. His Greek Grammar, in forty-three editions, from 1518 to 1622, had a similar sphere of usefulness. Works on rhetoric and dialectics, psychology, physics, ethics, history, and religion were also popular; some of them were even used in Catholic Schools (Hartfelder, 211 ff.; Richard, 134-136).

Melanchthon's influence, however, was probably greatest through his reorganization of the Universities. The change, of course, came first at Wittenberg. Already in 1518 Luther wished to have one of the teachers at Wittenberg, who was reading on Thomistic logic, lecture instead on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (De W. I. 190-222). In the same year Melanchthon dealt with Homer. Luther interceded for him, that he might be freed from the scholastic lectures on Aristotle's *Physics* (De W. I. 238). Other innovations in the curriculum are suggested in Luther's writing *To the Nobility* (Op. 21.277). Melanchthon was the soul of these changes, which revolutionized the Wittenberg curriculum. A summary of all the new departures is contained in the statutes for the government of the faculty of theology and liberal arts written in 1545 (C. R. 10.992).

The University of Marburg very soon adopted a plan almost identical with the order of studies at Wittenberg. Koenigsberg was founded in 1544, according to Melanchthon's directions, as was also Jena, in 1548. His plans were ultimately adopted by Tübingen, Leipzig, Heidelberg, Frankfurt a. O., Rostock, and Greifswald (Richard, 138). The outcome was a union of classical antiquity and of all sciences and philosophy with religious knowledge. The stand that Luther and Melanchthon took towards the Classics has determined the position of Latin and Greek in Germany to this day.

Space will not permit us to do more than to allude to the other leaders of Protestantism and their connection with antiquity. Zwingli, the Reformer of German Switzerland, was a thoroughgoing humanist before he became interested in Church reconstruction. Even afterward he taught the Classics at Zurich and had them taught in Schools under his supervision. Calvin, whose influence began in French Switzerland and spread to all Protestant Europe not under Luther's sway, began his career with an edition of Seneca's *De Clementia*. His School in Geneva was thoroughly steeped in Latin and Greek culture, and all the countless institutions which were founded after the model of this

'mother of Huguenot Seminaries' took from their parent a strong classical bias.

We may thus say that the leaders of Protestantism were all of them well trained in the Classics, that they had in fact a knowledge of the ancient literatures which is rare nowadays even among professional classicists. They appreciated the classical authors and made them a part of their lives. That this heritage of antiquity might not be lost to their descendants they incorporated them in their Schools. Protestantism adopted humanism as its educational standard.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, THEODORE ARTHUR BUENGER.  
Easton, Pa.

## REVIEWS

Latin Sentence Connection. By C. W. Mendell. New Haven: The Yale University Press (1917). Pp. x + 214. \$1.50.

This volume aims to be both psychological and syntactical. Chapter I is devoted to a sketch of the general psychological background of speech as set forth some years ago by Wundt and Morris. According to this view, a thought in the stream of consciousness becomes a subject of observation while yet in a nebulous state, its indefiniteness is cleared up through a process of analysis, and this analysis and its results are mirrored in verbal expression.

To the reviewer it has always seemed that this treatment of the subject is inadequate. Indeed, there is a touch of the grotesque in the portrayal of an individual in whose mind there arises a nebulous thought which comes bit by bit under the lime light of the mind's attention, while the lips, *pari passu*, utter a running commentary. On that basis it would seem that the unfortunate individual did not really know what he wanted to say until he had finished the spoken sentence or period.

Any adequate treatment of the subject surely must reckon with three undoubted facts: (1) much thinking does not begin in a nebulous haze; (2) much speaking—and more writing—does not proceed *pari passu* with the original marshaling of ideas in the mind of the speaker or the writer; (3) the constructive mental process by which words and constructions are chosen to suggest to the hearer or the reader a train of thought is not necessarily parallel to the genesis of the thought in the mind of the speaker or the writer.

We may illustrate very simply. If a pedestrian is about to step into the path of a swiftly moving car, the thought of the observer will be in no nebulous state as he apprehends that the pedestrian is in danger and that it is imperative that he halt. Yet, even in this crisis, the observer may not speak until the end of his original train of thought is reached; if so, he will probably reverse the order of his ideas as he suggests them to the pedestrian; e. g. 'Stop; you will be run down!' Not only is the order reversed, but the relation between the parts also is different. Probably the original nexus

was more complicated than appears on the surface; but surely there was an illative element involved, whereas in the spoken words the connection is causal.

Obviously it is not the process of inception of a thought that is of special interest to the student of syntax, but rather the mental process whereby forms of speech are chosen as a means of suggesting a train of thought to another person. Even in very informal speech, as shown above, the two processes may be anything but parallel, and in formal written expression the gap may be much greater. Take, for example, the poet who may be constrained by the limitations of his verse to say even what he had not planned; and if, as did Vergil at one period, he composes at the rate of a verse a day, a very labyrinth must intervene between 'original thought' and finished product. Nor does even this take into account the profoundly disturbing influence of speech habits.

Professor Mendell does not recognize clearly this very obvious distinction between original inception of a thought and the process by which speech material is chosen to suggest a train of thought to a hearer or a reader. Thus he declares (page 6) that, in language, "the object is to reproduce the *original concept*<sup>1</sup> in another mind"; and (86) that "sentences, by virtue of the psychological processes which produced them, were of necessity related before ever they were put on paper or even analysed into words". On the other hand, on pages 23 and 29 some apprehension of the real facts of the case seems momentarily to get the better of his theory.

This confusion of thought as to the general psychological background of speech affects little the validity of Professor Mendell's work, for the simple reason that, though he talks much of psychology, his study of Latin sentence connection actually rests but very slightly upon distinctly psychological considerations. For example, in Chapter I much space is given to selecting a definition for the term 'sentence', but in the subsequent discussion this does not seem to lead to any quarrel with the traditional punctuation of the Latin sentences examined. Again, we are carried back to an original *stream of consciousness* in the mind of a speaker or a writer to learn the fact of sentence connection; whereas the simple truth of the matter, namely, that, by placing sentences in juxtaposition, a speaker or a writer normally implies some connection between them, is a fact so patent that we do not need the help of psychology to recognize it, especially when psychological considerations are so badly confused as they are by the author at this point.

So, too, in Chapter II, which deals with the fundamental categories of sentence connection, it is vigorously insisted at the start that there is imperative need of a background of psychological theory; but, as the chapter progresses, it soon becomes clear (15) that, as a

matter of fact, the investigation is based upon the ordinary principals of syntactical study:

An *analysis of the means of sentence connection actually used by Latin writers* makes possible a rough division into three groups according to the chief element which gives to each its power to express thought relations and so convey them to the reader.

Such a foundation as this could be laid without even mentioning the word psychology.

The main business of the treatise is to study means of sentence connection, primarily in cases where conjunctions are absent. Chapter II declares that, generally speaking, these means are Repetition, Change, and Incompleteness. In the subsequent chapters, in which this thesis is developed, another confusion of thought—or at any rate of terminology—is everywhere encountered.

For example, the table of contents for Chapter III, which deals with the subject of Repetition, runs as follows:

Repetition. 1. Repetition of Content: its fundamental characteristics; its various types; the relations *expressed* by it; the conjunctions used to *supplement* its force. 2. Repetition of Function: its characteristics, typical uses, and significance; conjunctions used to *supplement* its force.

Chapter III itself reinforces at great length this same conception, namely that repetition is a fundamental element in sentence connection, and that, by a study of its phases, there will be brought to light types of sentence interrelation ordinarily marked by conjunctions.

This approach to the subject is likely to arouse expectations that cannot be realized; for, as the chapter progresses, it is gradually revealed that repetition merely marks the *fact of connection*, with very little indication of the *nature* of the connection. Quite reversing his first position, Professor Mendell now does not hesitate to recognize the fact that mere juxtaposition of sentences may imply connection, and that the postposition of a sentence may suggest a notion of "sequence". If so, it follows that the rôle of repetition may be but trifling. Compare what is said on pages 28 and 56:

So, when language simply and accurately represents action, each sentence is subsequent to its predecessor both temporally and logically. The description of an action given in the order of its occurrence *needs nothing to make clear the relation between sentences*. To be sure, the unity given to an action by the constant presence of a given actor is often reproduced by the repetition of a word representing that actor, *but this is not essential*.

The principle of repetition of content is evidently made use of to indicate *in a very general way* that the sentence in which the repetition occurs is logically subsequent to the one from which the concept is repeated. *Various forces determine into which of three types these instances fall*. The second sentence may indicate merely an additional item; or it may indicate the result of the first sentence; or, third, it may indicate the explanation of the first sentence.

It seems at least infelicitous to have introduced into the classification the category of Repetition as a domi-

<sup>1</sup>Here, as below, the italics are the reviewer's.



nant factor through which types of sentence relation are to be determined, when, as a matter of fact, its function may amount to nothing more than a somewhat fortuitous emphasis upon a relation whose existence is indicated by the relative position of the sentences, and whose specific nature is defined by "various forces" apart from the bare fact of repetition.

Within the limits of a brief review it is impossible to sift this matter to the bottom. But it is suggested that the inconsistent and ever-recurring tendency to ascribe to repetition the whole function of sentence connection shakes the reader's faith in the entire chapter, especially when it is found that "repetition" is stretched to cover sentences in which "repetition is implicit", i. e. in which there is no formal mark of repetition (48)<sup>2</sup>. The question is raised whether it would not be more confidence-inspiring if the problem were approached from the other point of view, that is, if sentences in juxtaposition were examined to determine the probable relation between them, this examination being followed by a study of *all* the elements that contribute to the reader's impression of the relation. Among these elements the bare fact of repetition would often be found to play a decidedly inferior part.

These criticisms, of course, do not mean that the treatise under examination lacks merit. The psychological background does seem somewhat irrelevant and not clearly thought out; and the emphasis placed upon such factors as repetition is thoroughly misleading; the real merit of the work lies in the care expended upon the large mass of material examined, and in the thoughtful observations upon the (variously defined) types of sentence relation found. Careful reading of the book cannot fail to show its suggestive value. That it is definitive in its method is much to be doubted.

Chapters IV, V, VI and VII deal with Retrospective Incompleteness, Change, Anticipatory Incompleteness and Parenthetic Incompleteness. The method followed is the same as in Chapter III, and it requires no further comment here. Chapter VIII sums up the whole situation, as the author sees it, and forecasts important discoveries through the further application of the method used.

The book is not, of course, of a kind suited for reading on a warm summer afternoon. For a work of its character, the style is fairly clear. But there are some blemishes that a subsequent edition should remove, e. g. "It may be possible in conclusion to win to some generalizations . . ." (14); "Experience has brought it about that the very fact of juxtaposition indicates a relation . . ." (16); "Also they will make the instances to follow more clear" (38); "a concept behind a noun" (48); "But that subject does not pick an item from the preceding sentence . . ." (50). Seldom is there real obscurity, as at the end of page 20:

This order of consideration will necessarily divide the discussion of the principle of Incompleteness, but with

<sup>2</sup>Chapter IV returns to the charge in the following words (86): "Repetition is the means employed to define to the reader the particular nature of the relation".

the elements of the problem so interwoven as they are in the present question, some violence cannot but be done to logical order and distinct advantages will be found in making the differentiation between retrospective and anticipatory means, the factor to determine the order of investigation.

In conclusion, one criticism of the general method of syntactical study now in vogue may not be out of place; and this criticism is made perhaps with a better grace, inasmuch as the reviewer is of the guild, and himself doubtless guilty in times past. Let it be confessed, then, that the attempt to draw psychology into syntactical discussion has resulted rather unfortunately in some respects. Most students of syntax are not psychologists, and they understand none too well the methods of that discipline; yet, as illustrated in the volume here under discussion, the writer of a syntactical treatise feels it incumbent upon him to provide a "psychological background", whether it is really essential or not, or even whether it is carefully thought out or not. Moreover, the effect upon the terminology of syntactical discussion has been very unfortunate. Often a full page or two of stilted exposition, embellished with psychological verbiage, serves to obscure an idea which, for all practical purposes of the discussion, might have been expressed by a terse clear sentence of a dozen words, with no reference to psychology. There is real danger that the general philological reading public will come to pass upon us the verdict which, in a different connection, Cicero passed upon the Epicureans (Tusc. Disp. 2.7): *Quam ob rem, quoniam quem ad modum dicant ipsi non laborant, cur legendi sint (nisi ipsi inter se, qui idem sentiunt) non intellego.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

The Antique Greek Dance, after Sculptured and Painted Figures. By Maurice Emmanuel. Translated by Harriet Jean Beauley. New York: John Lane Company (1916). Pp. xxviii + 304. \$3.00.

Maurice Emmanuel's work *La danse grecque antique* was published in Paris in 1896. It was the first attempt to study the evolutions of the dance of the ancient Greeks in a logical, rational way. The author collected references in Greek literature to the dance, then studied in Greek sculpture and painting representations of dance movements, which he sought to interpret by comparison with the steps and the figures of the modern French ballet. Emmanuel suffered from lack of archaeological training, and there are consequently many gaps in his accumulation of illustrative material, but the book is unique in its field and its value has been recognized and appreciated for twenty-one years.

The chief qualifications for a translator of a book are, first of all, knowledge of the language into which the translation is to be made, and ability to write that language lucidly and comprehensibly, the next a thorough knowledge of the language in which the original is written, and, finally, some familiarity with the subject treated. The present translator exhibits none of these qualifications. The English used in the

translation taken as a whole is such as would disgrace a schoolgirl. The translator does not betray as much knowledge of the French language as may be acquired in the first elementary course in French in a Grammar School. She does not know a negative statement from a positive, a noun from a verb, a masculine pronoun from a feminine. The moods and the tenses of the verb are unknown phenomena to her, and again and again to individual words are given meanings that are purely imaginary, or else the words are simply dropped out of the text, so that very strange lacunae appear in the English book. Moreover, the translator has not the slightest knowledge of the Greek language or of Greek archaeology, so that common Greek words and familiar masterpieces of ancient sculpture and painting appear in her version often in an unrecognizable masquerade. She takes no pains to copy accurately the names and references in the French work; indeed, there is no question of accuracy, but the marvel rather is that so many mistakes could possibly be made. For example, in a list at the end of the book of the six hundred figures of the text with a statement of the sources whence they were derived, I have noted not less than 358 errors, some totally misleading, others merely the omission of the French accent.

If this work were an original production, it would simply be cast aside as a stupid joke, in spite of the publisher's price of \$3.00, but, as it purports to be a translation of a dignified and notable French book, sufficient space must be taken to condemn it unsparingly. Almost every page reveals the translator's ignorance of French. So, on page 257 each of the seven paragraphs, with the exception of one of three lines, expresses just the opposite of the original or an absurd version of it. The few passages that will now be quoted to show the character of the work are taken almost at random from all parts of the book and are selected for their brevity as much as for anything else.

French edition, paragraph 44, page 33: *Les femmes grecques ne saisissent pas à main pleine, comme nos élégantes, la partie postérieure de la robe; ce n'est point de la boue ni de la poussière qu'elles se garent. Leur geste n'est qu'une coquetterie qui embellit la démarche, y introduit une certaine eurythmie et devient souvent, par son inutilité même, un geste nettement orchestrique.*

Translation, paragraph 44, page 27: The Greek woman made the gesture with great elegance, gathering up a handful of the fabric at the back to keep it from touching the ground and thus becoming soiled. The gesture is not one of coquetry, used to make the walk more attractive, but it introduces a kind of eurythmy, so that, when it ceases to be a gesture of utility, it is frankly a dance-movement.

Here not only are statements made in the translation the opposite in meaning to the language of the original, but the lucidity of the French becomes nonsense in the English version.

Another pair of parallel passages will illustrate how incomprehensible the English has become through ignorance of the simplest French words.

French edition, paragraph 56, page 42: *Un laquais de comédie, qui veut faire comprendre au spectateur quelle récompense il attend de son maître, et quel en sera l'instrument, se frotte le dos avec la main: c'est une métonymie.*

Translation, paragraph 56, page 33: What does the spectator at a comedy understand when one of the characters rubs the back of his hand? It is a metonymy.

These are not isolated instances of mistranslation. The entire book is a travesty on the original. I have made note of one hundred passages in which the translation makes statements exactly contrary to those found in the French. Equally frequent, too, are other errors of reference and citation, of Greek and archaeology. Only one example will be presented. The Greek author Athenaeus is mentioned six times in Emmanuel's book; in the translation he is called, on page 5, "Athenatus"; on page 23 he is "Athenus", on page 93 he becomes "Athenian"; on page 230 the name is omitted and the whole paragraph becomes nonsense; on page 239 we have "the Athenians"; on page 270 his name is omitted but his work is mentioned.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

T. LESLIE SHEAR.

#### THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

The New York Classical Club (formerly The New York Latin Club) will meet on Saturday, November 3, at noon, sharp, in the Students' Hall of Barnard College, Broadway and 177th Street, New York City. Luncheon will come at one o'clock. Addresses will be made as follows: Dr. John H. Finley, An Old Eclogue with a New Application; Dean A. F. West, How to get Results from the Classical Conference at Princeton; Marquis of Aberdeen and Témair, Struggles with the Classics at St. Andrew's and Oxford.

Those wishing to attend the luncheon are requested to communicate with the Treasurer, Dr. W. F. Tibbetts, Curtis High School, New Brighton, Staten Island, in advance.

#### CLASSICAL CONFERENCE AT VASSAR COLLEGE

On Saturday, December 1, from 9.30 to 12.45, there will be a Classical Conference at Vassar College, in connection with the annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. The programme follows:

Cumae in Legend and History, Professor Elizabeth H. Haight, Vassar College; The Function and Future of Classics in the High School, Miss Jessie E. Allen, President of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States; The Actual Situation of Latin in the Colleges, Dean Mervin G. Filler, Dickinson College; The Study of Horace, Professor N. G. McCrea; A Phase in the Development of Prose Style among the Romans, Professor Charles Knapp; The Higher Utility, President Charles A. Richmond, Union College; The Classic and the War, Dean Andrew F. West.